

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15239

Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, was recently honored by the New Jersey State Bar Association, and was selected as the recipient of the 1964 Amerigo Vespucci Award for "distinguished community service by Americans of Italian descent."

I have known and worked with Mr. Noto for several years. He is an outstanding and dedicated public servant, and I am proud to add my congratulations to the many he has already received for his fine record of public service.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution by the New Jersey State Bar Association, honoring Mr. Noto, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE NEW JERSEY STATE  
BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas the section on immigration and nationality law of the New Jersey State Bar Association, has a specific interest in the operation and procedures of immigration and nationality law; and

Whereas the members of this section have appeared before county bar associations' meetings as well as before patriotic and civic groups to discuss various phases of the law; and

Whereas the membership of this section participates actively in furthering the understanding of the immigration and nationality law among leading organizations in this State; and

Whereas the Honorable Mario T. Noto, Associate Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, has been invited to receive the 1964 Amerigo Vespucci Award for "Distinguished Community Service by Americans of Italian Descent"; and

Whereas this section regards this merited award with high favor in recognition of the dedicated public and community services rendered by the Honorable Mario T. Noto: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the section on immigration and nationality law of the New Jersey State Bar Association extends to Associate Commissioner Mario T. Noto, its congratulations and best wishes for continued success in all his endeavors.

Done at the city of Newark on the 27th day of April 1964.

AMERIGO D'AGOSTINO, Chairman.  
I. ARTHUR LEVY, Secretary.

## VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a column appearing in tonight's Evening Star by Max Freedman, entitled "Three Senators Agree on Vietnam."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., July 1, 1964]

THREE SENATORS AGREE ON VIETNAM—FULBRIGHT, HUMPHREY, CHURCH BELIEVE U.N. SHOULD DEFER ANY INTERVENTION

(By Max Freedman)

In the Senate the other day Senator CHURCH started a debate that soon spread to a discussion of the United Nations and the war in Vietnam. He did not intend to provoke such a discussion; he really wanted to

speak up in support of the United Nations and to protect it from attack by people like Senator GOLDWATER. But the mere mention of Vietnam was enough to stir a lively debate.

The first point to be noted about this discussion was that only Democrats took part in it. Senator GOLDWATER has tried to break the Republican Party into organized opposition to the way the Johnson administration has been behaving in Vietnam; but thus far his success has been negligible. The Republicans cannot shake out of their minds the warning by Ambassador Lodge that America's involvement in Vietnam dates back to the Eisenhower administration and since then has been supported by both parties. It is utterly unconvincing for Senator GOLDWATER to pretend now that he or any other Republican has a solution which is being willfully ignored by the folly of Washington.

As the debate showed, most Senators are not concerned with the morbid review of wrong turnings and past mistakes. They are more eager to prevent a bigger and more ruthless war, and nowhere is this anxiety stronger than in the Democratic Party.

That was the theme common to Senators CHURCH, FULBRIGHT, HUMPHREY, PELL, PROXMIER, and MORSE. An exception, however, must be made of Senator MORSE. He has advanced the grave charge that the American program in Vietnam "violates one international commitment after another." He commands no support for this view which is a libel on America advertised with all the authority that belongs to a senior Senator. Regardless of what else may have gone wrong, it is perverse and mischievous to regard the United States as the bandit nation in Vietnam. Senator MORSE should drop this argument before it sinks him incurably in the respect of the American people.

It is more useful to concentrate on Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator HUMPHREY. In Senator FULBRIGHT's judgment, the essential task now is to stabilize the military situation as the prelude to any political initiatives that may yet be taken. At present he sees no great role for the United Nations in putting an end to the struggle. But he does not exclude a possibility later. "If conditions should arise," Senator FULBRIGHT told the Senate, "in which it would be feasible for the United Nations to take over and maintain order, I would be in favor of that." Senator HUMPHREY, trying to put at rest all fears of a larger war, said "I do not favor accelerating the war. I believe I can say this Government does not." He agreed with Senator FULBRIGHT that one day the influence of the United Nations might well be both timely and constructive.

Quite plainly Senator CHURCH had impressed his colleagues by his warning against any new policy that would commit the United States to military attacks on Vietnam and military decisions that might also provoke a clash with China. No one dissented from his warning that we must ponder our next steps very carefully "if we are to avoid a tragic trail of casualties in Asia out of all proportion to the vital interests of the United States."

Some weeks ago great interest was taken in the announcement that Harlan Cleveland, who is in charge of United Nations affairs for the State Department, would attend the Honolulu Conference to review the problems of Vietnam and southeast Asia. It was generally felt that his presence in Honolulu would focus attention on what the United Nations could do to end the danger of a spreading war.

As it turned out Mr. Cleveland was unable to leave Washington because sudden anxieties over Cyprus kept him here. But that does not mean that he and his officials are avoiding the United Nations can do, at the right time, to promote stability and peace in this whole restless area.

Mr. MORSE. I shall proceed to answer that column by Mr. Freedman in respect to its references to the senior Senator from Oregon. In the course of the column Mr. Freedman says:

As the debate showed, most Senators are not concerned with the morbid review of wrong turnings and past mistakes. They are more eager to prevent a bigger and more ruthless war, and nowhere is this anxiety stronger than in the Democratic Party.

That was the theme common to Senators CHURCH, FULBRIGHT, HUMPHREY, PELL, PROXMIER and MORSE. An exception, however, must be made of Senator MORSE. He has advanced the grave charge that the American program in Vietnam "violates one international commitment after another." He commands no support for this view which is a libel on America advertised with all the authority that belongs to a senior Senator. Regardless of what else may have gone wrong, it is perverse and mischievous to regard the United States as the bandit nation in Vietnam. Senator MORSE should drop this argument before it sinks him incurably in the respect of the American people.

Mr. President, Mr. Freedman should get out to the hustings. Mr. Freedman should acquaint himself with American public opinion. For the benefit of Mr. Freedman, I incorporate by reference now every criticism that I have made of American foreign policy in southeast Asia, including the criticism to which he takes exception.

In his column today in the Washington Star Max Freedman undoes all the sound commentary he offered the American people last week when he warned:

Not even in his worst moments was John Foster Dulles ever guilty of such a crude and reckless act of brinkmanship as the one in which the Johnson administration has now stumbled.

Of course, he published that column in the Washington Evening Star, which contained the editorial paying its disrespect to the senior Senator from Oregon. I answered it some days ago on the floor of the Senate. In my reply to the editor of the Washington Star, I said that he should have read the column by Max Freedman published in the same issue that contained its editorial attacking the senior Senator from Oregon.

It is interesting to note this complete change of journalistic coloring on the part of Mr. Freedman in so short a time.

I wonder why. Could it be that his editors did not like the fact that in that column he took the position of the senior Senator from Oregon? As I pointed out, in that column Freedman laid down the major thesis of the criticism by the senior Senator from Oregon of shocking American policy in southeast Asia which, I repeat, in all probability, if it is not reversed, will lead us into a major war in Asia.

Today Mr. Freedman sounds frightened of his own analysis of our foreign policy in South Vietnam, which he published only a few days ago. On June 25 he pointed out that the threat of war made by administration officials against China "is more likely to divide and worry helping or to serve the cause of peace." But that is the only logical end to a policy we are now following in southeast

Asia. Our policy of military buildup and overwhelming economic aid to South Vietnam has failed to halt rebels successes. The next step was to threaten expansion of the war if the Communists did not voluntarily retreat.

The Government of the United States is threatening war in Asia. Let those who believe it is not stand up and deny it, for we cannot read the statements of this Government, from the President on down, and fail to recognize that those statements add up to a threat to war prosecuted by the United States in Asia unless Red China, Laos, North Vietnam and other areas do the bidding of the United States.

Having made the threat, we will have no choice but make good on it when the Communists decline to retreat. This entire policy depends upon Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung backing down before a threat that if they do not, their territory will be attacked by the United States.

One may as well expect the United States to leave Vietnam upon threat of dire consequences if we do not.

Mr. Freedman is also frightened of the concept that the United States is itself violating international agreements in southeast Asia. And we are. He does not deny that we are. He does not try to show that our actions are in conformity with the Geneva accords of 1954, or 1962, or with the United Nations Charter, because that is impossible. He merely puts a nasty label on anyone who does point out the bitter truth of the U.S. illegal action in southeast Asia—illegal action in southeast Asia that violates the United Nations Charter in articles 33, 36, 37, and 51—to mention only four specific instances of our violation.

Let Mr. Freedman or anyone else deny it. They cannot deny it if they can read the English language. The language is perfectly clear as to the obligation of any signatory to that Charter and the course of procedural action that should follow whenever peace is threatened anywhere in the world. Peace is seriously threatened in southeast Asia, and the responsibility of the United States is clear. We should take the threat to the United Nations, and not set ourselves up as the policeman of the world, self-appointed, to enforce our interpretation of existing treaties such as the Geneva accords.

Mr. Freedman may as well try to prove that the United States has the legal right to enforce a treaty between Russia and China as to prove that we have a unilateral right to enforce the Geneva accords of 1954, when we are not a party to them.

Who are we to set ourselves up as the enforcement country of the Geneva accords of 1954 when we did not even sign the accords, and when John Foster Dulles used his influence to prevent South Vietnam from signing them?

When we recognize that a violation of a treaty is threatening the peace of the world, this country has a clear duty to file charges before the United Nations. That the United States has not done. I wonder why. I wonder if it might be

that if the United Nations took jurisdiction it would find plenty of illegality on the part of the conduct of the United States to date in the course of action it has been following in southeast Asia?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I will confess I was also surprised at the abrupt about-face change in the attitude of Mr. Freedman from his previous article, in which he supported the view that the senior Senator from Oregon and I have been advocating, that we should stop our participation in the war in southeast Asia and try to wage peace; that it was a war we could not win militarily; that it was a war in which we should not have engaged in the first place; and that we should go to the United Nations and try to find a solution there.

Mr. Freedman published a column earlier, which either the senior Senator from Oregon or I put in the Record, to that effect. I am interested in the sudden change. What happened in between the publication of the two articles?

Mr. MORSE. We have our suspicions.

Mr. GRUENING. I can think of various explanations.

Mr. MORSE. But they would not redound to the credit of Mr. Freedman.

Mr. GRUENING. I do not know that I can comment on that; but, in any event, I think it is a regrettable change of attitude and an inconsistency that it would be useful for the columnist to explain to his readers.

Mr. MORSE. For the edification of Mr. Freedman, I repeat again that the United States is violating one international agreement after another by our policy in southeast Asia. We have already violated the 1954 Geneva agreement, and have been found in violation by the International Control Commission. We have admitted to violations of the Geneva accords of 1962, with the excuse that some one else violated them first.

This country has even sent into Laos armed military planes that have dropped bombs, which constitutes an act of war and aggression. It is a clear violation of the Geneva accord of 1962, which this country signed, and which I believe thereby constitutes an even more serious reflection on the United States. We have freely admitted to these violations, pointing out only that North Vietnam violated them first.

Our violations of the United Nations Charter, as I have pointed out time and time again in the past several weeks, have been many, and they are continuing up to the moment I speak.

The very assumption of Freedman and those he quotes that someday, sometime, somehow, and under some other circumstances, the United States will seek United Nations action is evidence that all of them know the issue is one of U.N. jurisdiction.

What they are all saying is only that the United States is not interested in the U.N. Charter now would serve American interests.

Are we to take the position that this country is being a peace-abiding nation; that we are going to resort to its obligations under treaties and international law only when we think to do so would serve our interests? If every country takes that position, that is the end of international law. International law then ceases to be of any force or effect in maintaining peace in the world, and becomes nothing but a sham and a shibboleth.

But when, under that type of international expediency, would this country ever take such a matter to the United Nations? Would we do it when war has engulfed North Vietnam? Do we think that when China is faced with the same situation she was faced with in Korea she will do what we have refused to do, and take the issue to the United Nations?

If we set such an example, we set the precedent for other nations to defy their obligations under international law.

Do we think that Red China will be willing to go to the U.N. or to the bargaining table when the war goes against her, although we refused to do so under the same circumstances?

What a folly! What a poor, lame, pathetic excuse for a war in Asia! "Now is not the time to negotiate; wait until we dominate the battlefield and then we will negotiate." If countries follow that course of action, there will be no sense in talking about resorting to the rule of law for settlement of issues that threaten the peace of the world. We shall then prove that our objective is to return to the jungle law of American military might.

I can see the United States going to the United Nations or the conference table had Russia come to dominate the Caribbean in 1962.

Mr. President, if we are going to take the position that the time to negotiate does not exist until we dominate the battlefield, then when we dominate the battlefield of southeast Asia, Red China will throw all she has into southeast Asia.

Remember this about our policy in Asia: A nation does not have to commit the first violation in order to be in violation of the Geneva accords. And it does not have to commit aggression in order to be in violation of the United Nations Charter; and all the journalistic squirming and weaseling by the Freedmans cannot change that ugly fact and that sad indictment against the United States.

We have violated these accords and the United Nations Charter time and time again. We are pursuing neither law nor peace in Asia. We are not even pursuing freedom. We are maintaining a military, tyrannical dictatorship over the South Vietnamese, headed by an American puppet to whom we give the orders, and who moves only under our orders.

Mr. President, whoever fights a war without taking the matter to the United Nations, is in violation of the charter, whether that party started the war or not.

Do not hide itself behind the alibi that we are not the only ones who are violating the Geneva ac-



1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15241

cords and the United Nations Charter. Of course we are not. The Communists in Asia are violating international law, too; but since when can the United States justify an act of illegality because someone else is committing an act of illegality? The fact that North Vietnam and the Communists in Laos and Red China are also threatening the peace in Asia does not justify our walking out on our international obligations. To the contrary, it makes it more important that we lay the charges before the United Nations, or go to a 14-nation Conference, or seek to get SEATO to come in and exercise peacekeeping policies until the United Nations can take over jurisdiction.

That has been the thesis of the Senator from Oregon for weeks. It will continue to be my thesis so long as my country follows its course of outlawry in southeast Asia. "Outlawry," I remind Max Freedman, means outside the law, and our policy in Asia today is outside the law.

Mr. Freedman's column today somehow carries all the overtones and pathos of the diplomats and generals who led their countries into World War I. It was always going to be the other side that was going to back down in the face of a magnificent navy or army or military machine, and any treaty that was inconvenient to national interests became "just a scrap of paper."

I never thought the time would come when my country would treat existing treaties as scraps of paper. My country's violation of the Geneva accords, of the United Nations Charter, and the Constitution itself, reflect the attitude of treating international obligations and constitutional obligations as scraps of paper.

Some of us have liked to think that the championing of the League of Nations by Woodrow Wilson, and later our active sponsorship of the United Nations marked an American commitment to the rule of law in world affairs, including our own interests in world affairs.

What we are doing in Asia is setting the United States above all that. Once we have decided an American interest was at stake, we have ignored our treaty obligations and our obligations to the United Nations. We have cranked up the American military machine to move into Asia.

The apologists who piously deplore spreading the war, but who in the meantime want to continue it in South Vietnam and Laos, rather than negotiate, are scarcely different from those who want to expand it. The war in South Vietnam is not going to get better for us. Perhaps it will not get any worse but I see no chance that it will get better. And the longer it continues under those circumstances, the more certain it is that the war will be expanded.

If a nation wants to live up to its international commitments, it must live up to them and not find excuses for avoiding them. The only policy in the world I am advocating for the United States is that we live up to the Geneva Accords and the U.N. Charter.

For Mr. Freedman's benefit, I repeat the language to which he takes such exception: The United States is violating one international commitment after another.

So we are.

GEN. MAXWELL D. TAYLOR, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last point I wish to make deals with the action taken by the Senate today in confirming the nomination of General Taylor as American Ambassador to South Vietnam.

When the Senate took that action—and I understand there were only a few Senators on the floor when it took place—I was downstairs in the Committee on Foreign Relations presenting an argument against a shocking waste of taxpayer funds in a foreign aid program that is in need of drastic revision.

I was not aware that the Taylor nomination was to be brought up at that time. It was well known that I voted against the confirmation of the Taylor nomination in committee. I wish briefly to say for the record that I think nominating General Taylor as American Ambassador to South Vietnam was a most unfortunate mistake, and for the following reasons:

First, it is known around the world that General Taylor was one of the architects, along with McNamara and Rusk, of the war plans of the United States in Vietnam.

It is unfortunate that we should send as our Ambassador to South Vietnam a military leader—and a very able military leader he is, too—when all the world has its eyes turned to the hope for peace. The appointment of General Taylor as Ambassador to South Vietnam increases the possibility of our going into a full scale war in Asia if the Red Chinese and the North Vietnamese do not back down under American threats.

I am also satisfied that General Taylor will not hesitate to advocate the escalating of that war into North Vietnam and into Red China and into Laos if the Red Chinese do not quiver and quake and retreat.

I have great regard for General Taylor as a military leader. If we get into a war, I believe we shall find that most military experts in this country will agree with the observation I now make, namely, that we probably have a no more able potential theater commander for that war than General Taylor. But he has no place behind the desk of an Ambassador.

There is a growing trend in this Republic for the military to take over more and more policy determinations. I had hoped that we would make it more clear than it has been made to date that under our constitutional system it is not for the military to determine policy, but to carry out orders; and that American foreign policy should be determined by the civilian branch of the Government—by the President, his chief agent, the Senate, and the Congress.

The symbolism of putting this general behind an Ambassador's desk in South Vietnam is uncalled for and unfortunate. It will be subject to great misunderstanding, and will accrue to the great disadvantage of the standing of the United States in many parts of the world, particularly in the so-called underdeveloped nations. I am satisfied that great fear is developing toward the United States in the underdeveloped nations. They are beginning to see great differences between our preachments and our practices, and are beginning to raise questions about the hypocrisy of the United States in the field of foreign policy.

Furthermore, I have heard General Taylor as a witness before the Foreign Relations Committee over a period of years. He has demonstrated his great ability, his wide knowledge, and his expertness in the field of military affairs. But he has never instilled any confidence in his ability in the field of foreign policy.

How well I remember the stunning shock that I suffered at the time of the Berlin crisis when, listening to General Taylor and General White, I came to realize that I was listening to two American military leaders who would not hesitate to drop the nuclear bomb, as though that would settle any issue involving the peace of the world.

General Taylor is among those in the Pentagon who has an itchy trigger finger when it comes to the use of nuclear power in case we are challenged and our bluff is called. I want to avoid those challenges. I think one of the best ways to avoid those challenges is to have the United States stop bluffing, because we may have our bluff called.

The sad thing is that if we do, a nuclear war will be on, and there will be no victory. I have no confidence whatever in General Taylor in the field of American foreign policy. Taking his uniform off and putting him behind an Ambassador's desk will not change the fact that his orientation is the orientation of the military, not the orientation of civilian foreign policy.

The symbolism of his appointment is most unfortunate. My President should have selected someone such as the man he selected as Deputy Ambassador, Mr. Alexis Johnson, or some other outstanding career officer in the Foreign Service of the State Department, rather than to dip into the Pentagon and take a military general to direct American foreign policy in southeast Asia.

As I said to Mr. Lodge in person yesterday, when he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, it is unfortunate that a former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the former Ambassador of the United States to South Vietnam, should return to the United States and tell the American people, in effect, that the time is not propitious for us to take the southeast Asia crisis to the United Nations. I shall never be able to understand how a former Ambassador to the United Nations can make such a complete failure to uphold our obligations under

July 1

15242

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

the United Nations Charter. If it were not so tragic, it would be amusing, when one considers the answer he has given to the proposal to go to a 14-nation conference, as recommended by the President of France, Mr. de Gaulle. What are we afraid of? No one is suggesting that while we are at that 14-nation Conference we should abandon southeast Asia. No one is suggesting that while the Security Council and, if necessary, the General Assembly consider the United Nations jurisdiction, we remove ourselves from southeast Asia, although I wish we would desist from our warmaking in southeast Asia and start a policy of peacekeeping.

I would, as I have said so many times, while the matter is before a 14-nation Conference, as recommended by De Gaulle, or before the Security Council or before the General Assembly, call upon our alleged—and I underline the word "alleged"—SEATO allies to join us with a sufficient body of men to patrol the area, to keep the adversaries separate, and to stop the killing and warmaking until the procedures of the United Nations can be brought to work upon the threat to the peace of Asia and, potentially, the peace of the world.

The position taken by Henry Cabot Lodge cannot be reconciled to any degree with the clear international obligations of the United States under the United Nations Charter.

I did not expect that the stature of the President of France for peacekeeping would rise above the stature of the President of the United States; but at this hour, that is exactly what is happening. The President of France is becoming recognized in many areas of the world as more determined and dedicated to the cause of peace than the President of the United States, because the President of France is calling for negotiation. The President of France is calling for the conference table. The President of France is calling for the application of the rule of law to the threat of peace in Asia.

The President of the United States is rattling the saber and telling the world that we are willing to risk war with Red China unless Asia accepts American policy in southeast Asia.

I cannot understand why my Government cannot see, before it is too late, that that kind of warmaking policy on the part of the United States spells trouble. Let me make it clear, as I close, that there is no question that we are joined in our outlawry by South Vietnam, by North Vietnam, by the Pathet Lao Communists in Laos, and by Red China.

Does that justify our outlawry? Does that justify the policy of expediency applied to international affairs which best describes American policy tonight in Asia? Does the end-justifies-the-means principle square with American precepts of foreign policy?

Since when do two wrongs make a right?

Never before has that been our policy. I pray again that my country will see the horrendous mistake it is making in Asia as a matter of policy, before it

I close by saying, for the benefit of those who do not like my speeches and for the benefit of such journalists as Mr. Freedman, "You had better check it with the American people."

I am satisfied that millions of fellow Americans, as they begin to understand the issue at stake in southeast Asia, will support my position.

I can now say, along with the Senator from Alaska, that my mail is running better than 100 to 1 in support of my position. My mail is coming in from coast to coast, as Senators will see some samples placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from time to time. I placed a large quantity in the RECORD today. It is coming from the leaders of many communities in this country.

I wish to state to President Johnson that I am satisfied that the American people do not approve of America's warmaking policy in Asia, and that the American people wish the President of the United States to join with the President of France and other advocates of negotiation, that we go to the conference table and seek to apply the rule of law to the crisis which exists in Asia.

I say most respectfully to my President, whom I shall continue to support on most issues, that I oppose him on this issue only because I owe a greater trust to my country than I owe to him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, announces the appointment as members on the part of the Senate of the National Commission on Food Marketing, created by Senate Joint Resolution 71, the following Senators, namely, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEZ], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORROW], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is in the Chamber; and we have discussed the problem presented to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Judiciary Committee in meeting tomorrow, in view of the time set for the beginning of the session of the Senate.

We have cleared this with those involved, and I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, not only is there no objection, but I also concur in the request of the Senator from Washington that there has been clearance on this matter with the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With-

## TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 6. An act to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10433. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

## ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. HART by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2972) for the relief of Dr. David J. Sencer, U.S. Public Health Service, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted two amendments (Nos. 1089 and 1090), intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted an amendment (No. 1091), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) submitted an amendment (No. 1092), intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ELLENDER submitted amendment (No. 1093), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO IMPOSE A TAX ON ACQUISITIONS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SECURITIES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 1094

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8000) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acq-